



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

---

### PASSER

Catull. *Carm.* ii

The charm of this poem, blurred as it is by a corrupt manuscript tradition, has made it one of the most famous in Catullus' book. To reconstruct the piece, to restore exact line and detail to the half-divined beauties of the blurred design—this is an ambition which may excuse some temerities of conjecture.

And since the diseased area is large, I shall offer a cumulative argument in which the probabilities of correction at each vitiated point strengthen each other in proportion as the total reconstruction may be judged acceptable.

1. The vulgate text presents the following difficulties or peculiarities: vs. 1: Query: Is *Passer* nominative or vocative? Presumably vocative: at least, so all editors have taken it. But if vocative, is it not very surprising that after throwing this extra high light on the addressee of the poem, Catullus lets him fall so far in the shade that, except a single *tecum* in vs. 9, we have not a verb nor a pronoun, all through, of the second person? Compare it with vi, viii, ix, xiii—for examples—and you feel that this piece has been twisted away from its true orientation. A *tu* or a *te* is to be expected in the text to carry on the intention of that emphatic initial vocative *Passer*.

2. All the editors swallow *desiderio meo nitenti* (Friedrich even acclaims it for "wundervoll"), and all explain the words by the analogy of *hem*, *mea lux*, *meum desiderium*, etc. But at the risk of appearing presumptuous I must beg leave to deny that it is Latin to use any such expression in the genitive or dative or ablative case. You can say *lux mea* as nominative or vocative; possibly by a stretch you can say *lucem meam vidi* (though I fancy it would be an ultra-comic phrase); but until any critic shall produce an instance of *luci meae* or *lucis meae* used as hypocoristics, I deny that Latin idiom expresses these cases except by apostrophe: for *lucis meae oculos* you must say *tuos*, *lux mea, oculos*; for the dative of *desiderium meum* you must say *tibi, desiderium meum*. A single authentic instance will suffice to shake this assertion. But neither Ellis nor Baehrens nor Friedrich nor any of the commentators that I can discover, cites anything to support the assumed extension of this poetical figure to the dative or the genitive case.

3. In vss. 8, 9, the false sequence *acquiescet . . . possem* shows that the text is amiss.

4. Vss. 11-13: Ellis' apparatus exhibits the great variety of suggestions which editors have made for disposing of these lines. I wish here to take it for granted that some transposition is necessary. Doubtless those lines were adrift in a margin and took shelter in a blank space at the end of this poem, but I think that the chances are rather in favor of the lines belonging to our poem than to another. To what part of it they belong is an unprejudiced question.

5. In vs. 11, many editors have seen that *est* is otiose and inelegant: but how did *est* come into the text at all? What motive had any scribe for inserting an *est* which was needless for meter and for sense?

6. Supposing these lines (11-13) to concern the *Passer* at all, how might one expect the comparison of Atalanta's apple to square with Lesbia's sparrow? Is it not reasonable that sparrow should answer to apple, Lesbia to Atalanta? Is it not rather uncouth for Catullus himself to answer to Atalanta in one part of the comparison, and the other part to be wholly vague?

Now to satisfy these desiderata in order:

1 and 3. In vs. 6 read *TE solacium sui doloris*, and in vs. 11 *tam gratum ES mihi*; and in vs. 8, for *credo ut cum gravis acquiescet* read *UT TECUM gravis ACQUIESSET ardor*.

2. Give the words *desiderio meo* their obvious, *prima facie* meaning, as in *at desiderio*, *Tulle*, *movere meo*, Prop. iii. 22. 6; *ut facile scias desiderio id fieri tuo*, Ter. *Heaut.* 307, namely Lesbia's yearning for the absent Catullus, and we should expect a sentence of the form *cum desiderio meo movetur*. *Movetur* is paleographically unlikely here, but Cicero writes *desiderio teneri* for *desiderio moveri*. I submit that *cum desiderio meo TENETUR* ("when she feels yearning for me") is paleographically an easy substitution.

4 and 5. The presence of the superfluous and offensive *est* in vs. 11 is natural enough if we accept the reading of ed. Parmensis 1473 *es: tam gratum ES mihi quam ferunt puellae*. . . . The idiomatic neuter in the predicate would readily cause *es* to be corrupted into *est*.

6. It will follow that Lesbia speaks the line and speaks it to the sparrow, which restores a reasonable fitness to the terms of the comparison—Lesbia: Atalanta::*passer*: *aureolum malum*.

To sum up these details, the reconstruction will be completed as follows:

Passer, deliciae meae puellae,  
Quicum ludere quem in sinu tenere,  
Quoi primum digitum dare adpetenti  
Et acris solet incitare morsus,  
  
Cum desiderio meo TENETUR,  
Karum nescioquid IUBET iocari  
TE, solacium sui doloris,

"Tam gratum ES mihi quam ferunt puellae  
 "Pernici aureolum fuisse malum  
 "Quod zonam soluit diu ligatam!"

10

UT TEcum gravis acquiescet ardor!  
 tecum ludere sicut ipsa possem  
 Et tristis animi levare curas!

A few remarks in conclusion. In vs. 6 IUBET is a MS variant, not a mere conjecture. Also in vs. 11 for the excision of *credo* as a gloss I can claim authority from Ellis' note, "it is not uncommon to find in MSS *credo* written in the margin as an expression of the scribe's opinion on some obscure, or obscurely written and not wholly decipherable word." In vs. 11 ACQUIESSET = *acquiescet* seems to me to have at least paleographically a good deal of probability; the uncommon syncopated form was almost bound to give rise to *acquiescet* in copying. The tense perhaps needs some justification. I would render it "were I with thee, how instantly would my passion heat get lulled *and done with*." In primary time *acquieverit* would mean "will get lulled and done with;" the pluperfect expresses the same instantaneousness in the secondary time; *acquiesceret* would be too gradual, too inceptive, to give what I conceive to be Catullus' meaning.

Tam gratum es mihi quam ferunt puellae, etc.

If it be objected that there is a violence in making the three lines (8-10) a quotation of Lesbia's supposed talk to the sparrow, although no verb of saying expressly introduces them, I would suggest that it is possible a line is lost between 7 and 8, something like

"Passer, deliciae meae," inquit illa.

As I give the piece it is articulated 1 3 3 3 3. The hypothetical line would give us a scheme of 1 3 3:1 3 3. The appropriateness of vss. 11-13 as counterpart to vss. 2-4 is manifest.

J. S. PHILLIMORE

THE UNIVERSITY  
 Glasgow

### SOME INDIC COGNATES OF GREEK τηλίκος

The equation of Pāli and Prākṛit *tārisa-* with Greek *τηλίκος*, advocated by Bartholomae, *IF.* 3, p. 160, and accepted by Wackernagel, *AiGr.* i, p. xxi, has been rejected by Pischel, *Grammatik*, § 245, and Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>e</sup> p. 496. The fact that in these languages *d* and *r* apparently interchange as correspondents to Indic *d* (e.g. Pāli *tādica-*, *tārisa-*; *dvādasa*, *bārasa*) would seem to be ample reason for refusing to go outside the Indic languages for the explanation of